UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS

TERIZA SHEHATOU, INDIVIDUALLY, CINDY LOUKA P.P.A. TERIZA SHEHATOU AND SALLY LOUKA P.P.A. TERIZA SHEHATOU, Plaintiffs)		- -		
v. CHERYL L. SCHARDT, JAY A. HOPKINS, P. KEYBURN HOLLISTER, JOHN R. GOBEL, ALLSTATE INSURANCE COMPANY and COMMERCE INSURANCE COMPANY, Defendants	`)))))	Docket No.	05-301	195 - P	4PN

COMPLAINT

PARTIES

- 1. Plaintiff Teriza Shehatou, M.D. (hereinafter "Shehatou") is an individual citizen of the State of New York, residing in Baldwinsville, Onondaga County, New York.
- 2. Plaintiff Cindy Louka is a minor whose date of birth is February 13, 1994, and is an individual citizen of the State of New York, residing with her mother, Teriza Shehatou, in Baldwinsville, Onondaga County, New York, and brings this action by and through her mother.
- 3. Plaintiff Sally Louka is a minor whose date of birth is April 20, 1997, and is an individual citizen of the State of New York, residing with her mother, Teriza Shehatou, in Baldwinsville, Onondaga County, New York, and brings this action by and through her mother.
- 4. Defendant Cheryl L. Schardt (hereinafter "Schardt") is an individual citizen of the State of Connecticut, residing in Bolton, Tolland County, Connecticut.
- 5. Defendant Jay A. Hopkins (hereinafter "Hopkins") is an individual citizen of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, residing in Pittsfield, Berkshire County, Massachusetts.

- 6. Defendant P. Keyburn Hollister (hereinafter "Hollister") is an individual who resides in Pittsfield, Berkshire County, Massachusetts.
- 7. Defendant John R. Gobel (hereinafter "Gobel") is an individual who resides in Pittsfield, Berkshire County, Massachusetts.
- 8. Upon information and belief, defendant Allstate Insurance Company (hereinafter "Allstate") is a foreign corporation organized and existing under the laws of the State of Illinois with its principle place of business located at Sanders Road, Suite H1A, Northbrook, Cook County, Illinois.
- 9. Upon information and belief, defendant Commerce Insurance Company (hereinafter "CIC") is a Massachusetts company organized and existing under the laws of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts with its principal place of business located at 211 Main Street, Webster, Worcester County, Massachusetts.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

- 10. Subject matter jurisdiction is predicated upon diversity of citizenship as set forth in 28 USC § 1332 and the matter in controversy exceeds \$75,000, exclusive of interest and costs.
- 11. Venue is proper in the District of Massachusetts, pursuant to 28 USC § 1391(a)(2), because it is the judicial district in which a substantial part of the events or omissions giving rise to the claim occurred.

FACTS

12. On or about May 21, 2003, an automobile accident occurred at or near the intersection of East Housatonic Street and Wendell Avenue in Pittsfield, Berkshire County, Massachusetts (hereinafter "the Accident") when a motor vehicle owned by Schardt, operated by Hopkins and insured by Allstate (hereinafter "the Schardt Vehicle") was involved in a collision

with a vehicle owned by Hollister, operated by Gobel and insured by CIC (hereinafter "the Hollister Vehicle").

- 13. At said time and place, Hopkins was operating the Schardt Vehicle with Schardt's knowledge and/or permission.
- 14. At said time and place, Hopkins was negligent in the operation of the Schardt Vehicle.
- 15. At said time and place, Gobel was operating the Hollister vehicle with Hollister's knowledge and/or permission.
- 16. At said time and place, Gobel was negligent in the operation of the Hollister Vehicle.
- 17. At the time of the Accident, Shehatou was a restrained passenger in the rear passenger-side seat of the Hollister Vehicle.

<u>COUNT I</u> (Shehatou - Negligence)

- 18. Plaintiffs restate and incorporate herein by reference the averments set forth in paragraphs 1 through 17 above.
- 19. As a proximate result of defendant Hopkins' and Gobel's negligence, Shehatou sustained personal and permanent injuries, suffered great pain of body and mind, incurred substantial medical expenses, and suffered a loss of earning capacity.

WHEREFORE, plaintiff Teriza Shehatou demands judgment against defendants Hopkins, Gobel, Hollister and Schardt, and each of them, in an amount equal to the actual damages suffered, together with interest, costs and any and such other relief as this Court deems appropriate.

COUNT II (Cindy Louka) (Loss of Parental Consortium)

- 20. Plaintiffs restate and incorporate herein by reference the averments set forth in paragraphs 1 through 17 above.
- 21. As a proximate result of the bodily injury sustained by Shehatou as a result of the Accident, Cindy Louka has suffered a loss of parental consortium.

WHEREFORE, plaintiff Cindy Louka demands judgment against defendants Hopkins, Gobel, Hollister and Schardt, and each of them, in an amount equal to the actual damages suffered, together with interest, costs and any and such other relief as this Court deems appropriate.

COUNT III (Sally Louka) (Loss of Parental Consortium)

- 22. Plaintiffs restate and incorporate herein by reference the averments set forth in paragraphs 1 through 17 above.
- 23. As a proximate result of the bodily injury sustained by Shehatou as a result of the Accident, Sally Louka has suffered a loss of parental consortium.

WHEREFORE, plaintiff Sally Louka demands judgment against defendants Hopkins, Gobel, Hollister and Schardt, and each of them, in an amount equal to the actual damages suffered, together with interest, costs and any and such other relief as this Court deems appropriate.

COUNT IV (Shehatou v. Allstate and CIC)

24. Plaintiffs restate and incorporate herein by reference the averments set forth in paragraphs 1 through 17 above.

- 25. Allstate and CIC are engaged in trade and commerce within the scope of G.L. c. 93A.
- 26. Allstate and CIC are engaged in the business of insurance pursuant to G.L. c. 176D.
- 27. On or about February 11, 2005, Shehatou's counsel sent a demand letter to Allstate and CIC in an attempt to settle the claim.
- 28. On or about May 5, 2005, Shehatou's counsel sent correspondence to Allstate and CIC in an attempt to settle the claim and reminding Allstate and CIC of their obligations under G.L. c. 93A and 176D.
- 29. On or about June 2, 2005, approximately four months after the demand of Shehatou's counsel, an offer of settlement was finally made.
- 30. On or about July 18, 2005, Shehatou's counsel sent a demand letter pursuant to G. L. c. 93A and 176D to Allstate and CIC. (See correspondence dated July 18, 2005, hereto attached as Exhibit A.)
- 31. On or about August 1, 2005, Allstate responded to the demand letter. (See correspondence dated August 1, 2005, hereto attached as Exhibit B.)
- 32. On or about August 15, 2005, CIC responded to the demand letter. (See correspondence dated August 15, 2005, hereto attached as Exhibit C.)
- 33. Allstate and CIC have violated G.L. c. 176D, § 3(9) through, *inter alia*, failing to effectuate a prompt, fair and equitable settlement of the claims of Shehatou and her minor children in which liability has become reasonably clear.
- 34. As a direct and proximate result of Allstate's and CIC's deceptive and unfair trade practices, Shehatou has suffered damages, including the loss of use of her settlement funds.

WHEREFORE, plaintiff Teriza Shehatou demands judgment against defendants Allstate Insurance Company and Commerce Insurance Company for compensatory damages, doubled or trebled pursuant to G. L. c. 93A, § 9(3), interest and costs of suit, including reasonable attorneys' fees pursuant to G. L. c. 93A, § 9(4), and any and all such other relief as this Court deems just.

PLAINTIFFS DEMAND A TRIAL BY JURY ON ALL ISSUES SO TRIABLE

Dated: 8 - 37 - 05

THE PLAINTIFFS

By their attorneys,

Chris S. Dodig BBO No. 556628

For Donovan & O'Connor, LLP

1330 Mass MoCA Way

North Adams, MA 01247

Tel. (413) 663-3200

Fax (413) 663-7970

CSD/BDL:jll:lac

Case 3:05-cv-30195-KPN Document 1 Filed 09/01/2005 Page 7 of 16

EXHIBIT A



1330 Mass MoCA Way North Adams, Massachusetts 01247 413.663.3200 fax: 413.663.7970

July 18, 2005

Ms. Terresa Sharp Allstate Insurance Company Connecticut Casualty Office 74 Batterston Road Farmington, CT 06032

Re: Your Insured: Your Claim No.: 3963640613

Our Client:

Date of Loss:

Teriza (Louka) Shehatou

Cheryl Schardt

May 21, 2003

Philip H. Grandchamp Donald W. Goodrich+ John D. Lanoue J. Norman O'Connor, Jr. Janice J. Cook David B. Mongue+ Chris S. Dodig"; Gordon P. Black ## Stephen N. Pagnotta

Danielle D. Fogarty"#

Document 1

As. ATES James R. Loughman Michael R. Palmieri** Stephen F. Narey Brigid M. Hennessey Amy E. Palmer Michael R. Berube Buffy D. Lord SENIOR COUNSEL J. Norman O'Connor OF COUNSEL

Filed 09/01/2005

John I. Curtin Cecil Driver

"Also admitted NY ‡ Also admitted VT ** Admitted VT only

Page 8 of 16

VERMONT OFFICE: 116 South Street P.O. Box 1033 Bennington Vermont 05201-1(133 802.442.3233 fax: 802.447.297(+

email: mail@docattv.com EIN 04-2198966

Ms. Keryn McKeon Commerce Insurance Company 11 Gore Road Webster, MA 01570

P. Keyburn Hollister RW8771-MCM265 Teriza (Louka) Shehatou

May 21, 2003

Dear Ms. Sharp and Ms. McKeon:

As you are aware from our previous correspondence, including the correspondence dated February 11, 2005 (attached hereto and incorporated by reference herein), this office represents Dr. Teriza (Louka) Shehatou with regard to injuries she sustained arising out of a motor vehicle collision that occurred at or near the intersection of East Housatonic Street and Wendell Avenue in Pittsfield, Massachusetts, on May 21, 2003. We are writing to advise you that we believe Allstate Insurance Company and Commerce Insurance Company have violated G.L. c. 93A and 176D. This is a formal demand letter sent to both companies pursuant to G.L. c. 93A, § 9.

The collision occurred when a motor vehicle owned by Allstate Insurance Company's insured, Cheryl Schardt, and operated by Jay Hopkins was involved in a collision with a vehicle owned by, Commerce Insurance Company's insured, P. Keyburn Hollister and operated by John Gobel. At the time of the collision, Teriza Shehatou, M.D. was a seat-belted passenger in the rear seat of the vehicle owned by Hollister. Our conclusion is that both drivers bear some responsibility for this accident and are therefore jointly and severally liable for the damages suffered. We understand that the Hollister policy limit is \$300,000 and the Hopkins policy limit is \$100,000.

As a result of the collision, Dr. Shehatou was knocked unconscious for a brief period of time. Immediately following the collision, Dr. Shehatou was transported via ambulance to the emergency department at Berkshire Medical Center. Among other things, the emergency department records revealed that Dr. Shehatou was unable to recall the collision and that there was evidence that she had struck her head. Dr. Shehatou's complaints of pain in her right

Mr. Jason Wieczorek Allstate Insurance Company Mr. Philip Curry Commerce Insurance July 18, 2005 Page 3

Dr. Shehatou treated with Chiropractic Care of Granby, Connecticut, on August 16, 2003. complaining of constant pain to her right shoulder, neck and upper back. A physical examination was performed at this time and confirmed Dr. Shehatou's injuries. Dr. Shehatou was referred to physical therapy in an attempt to alleviate her symptoms. From August 16, 2003, through January 10, 2004, Dr. Shehatou treated with Chiropractic Care of Granby thirteen times. Dr. Shehatou's continued complaints of shoulder, neck and back pain were noted on her final day of physical therapy treatment.

On January 12, 2004, Dr. Shehatou treated with Michael A. Miranda, M.D., of Orthopedic Associates of Hartford. Dr. Shehatou presented with an eight-month history of right shoulder pain. It was noted that her right shoulder injury limited her ability to function both in her personal and professional endeavors. Dr. Miranda's impression was that Dr. Shehatou was suffering from a partial rotator cuff tear with persistent pain. Dr. Miranda scheduled Dr. Shehatou for surgery at Hartford Hospital to repair her rotator cuff.

On February 13, 2004 (9 months after the accident), Dr. Shehatou presented at Hartford Hospital for arthroscopic surgery to repair her right rotator cuff tear. Upon completion of the surgery, Dr. Shehatou was given a prescription for Vicodin to take as needed. She was instructed to follow up with Dr. Miranda's office.

Dr. Shehatou followed up with Dr. Miranda on February 23, 2004. Dr. Miranda noted that Dr. Shehatou continued to experience marked limitation in her range of motion and that her wounds were healing well. Dr. Miranda recommended that Dr. Shehatou continue to work on her passive range of motion and external rotation and to follow up in five weeks for reevaluation.

On March 29, 2004, Dr. Shehatou treated with Dr. Miranda as a follow up to her rotator cuff repair. Dr. Miranda noted that Dr. Shehatou was experiencing persistent pain anteriorly. At this time, Dr. Shehatou was instructed to begin treatments focusing on strength and range of motion. From January 12, 2004, through November 24, 2004, Dr. Shehatou underwent physical therapy at Orthopedic Associates of Hartford twenty-nine times. Significantly, Dr. Shehatou developed tendonitis over the course of her treatment. Further, on her last day of treatment, Dr. Shehatou continued to suffer residual discomfort in her shoulder. At that time, Dr. Shehatou was instructed to continue an independent exercise program to improve strength and range of motion and to follow up with the office as her symptoms required.

Case 3:05-cv-30195-KPN Document 1 Filed 09/01/2005 Page 10 of 16

EXHIBIT B

Minimula Mandal Mandal

August 01, 2005

INSURED: CHERYL SCHARDT DATE OF LOSS: May 21, 2003 CLAIM NUMBER: 3963640613 DRT

Your client: Teriza Shehatou

PHONE NUMBER: 800-726-2235 FAX NUMBER: 860-676-4106

OFFICE HOURS: Mon - Fri 8:00am - 5:30pm

Dear Chris Dodig,

I am in receipt of your letter dated July 18, 2005 in which you alleged violation of G.L.c. 93A and 176D. We deny any violation of any Massachusettes General Laws.

I have spoken to Ms. Keryn McKeon of Commerce Insurance Company and have evaluated and agreed that this claim is worth a total of \$36,400.00. This would be \$18,200.00 from each company. This offer has previously been extended to you.

If you have any questions feel free to call.

Sincerely,

ROBERTTAYLOR

ROBERT TAYLOR 860-284-2324 Allstate Property and Casualty Insurance Company

School Proplant

3963640613 DRT

410-001V

EXHIBIT C

Commerce Insurance



Members of The Commerce Group, Inc.
11 Gore Road, Webster, Massachusetts 01570 (508) 949-1500
www.commerceinsurance.com

August 15 2005

CLAIMS DEPT.

Attorney Chris Dodig 1330 Mass MoCA Way North Adams, MA 01247

RE:

Insured: P Keyburn Hollister

File #: RW8771 -

Date of Loss: 5/21/2003

Claimant: Teriza (Louka) Shehatou

Dear Attorney Dodig:

This letter is in response to your correspondence of 7/19/05 which alleges that Commerce Insurance Company has violated Massachusetts General Laws, Chapter 93A and 176D. Without waiving our right to contest the adequacy of your demand letter, should this matter be litigated, we take this opportunity to respond.

On 5/22/03, Commerce Insurance Company was notified of this motor vehicle accident. Your client was a passenger in our insured's vehicle. As a result of our liability investigation, it was deemed that our insured was not 100% at fault for this accident. We placed Allstate Insurance Company on notice for joint tort feasor contribution as the insurer for Cheryl Schardt. Allstate is in agreement with our liability assessment and they are contributing 50% towards the settlement of Ms. Shehatou's Bodily Injury claim. The Part 5 Optional Bodily Injury coverage for Commerce Insurance Company is \$250,000/\$500,000 and for Allstate it is \$100,000/\$300,000.

We were in receipt of your demand package dated 2/11/05. As indicated, the prior adjuster was out on a leave of absence and the file had been transferred to me for further handling. We had requested copies of your client's primary care physician's records from Berkshire Care. The records of Dr. Bruce Renfrew were received on 5/5/05. On 6/2/05, we faxed a letter of response to your letter of 5/5/05 in which you cited impressions of possible 93A/176D violations. This letter of 6/2/05 included an offer of settlement of \$17,095.58. This offer reflected 50% of the total value of the claim since we had not received a response from Allstate Insurance Company as to their evaluation and range of settlement.

On 6/30/05, in response to your follow up letter of 6/7/05 in which you again noted possible 93A/176D violations, we were able to speak with the claims representative at Allstate Insurance Company who concurred with our evaluation range. Based on further review of our evaluation, and in the spirit of compromise, we agreed to increase our

File #: RW8771

August 8, 2005 Page 2

offer to reflect a combined offer at 100% of \$36,400.00. We then received your latest letter of 7/19/05 in which allegations of possible 93A/176D violations are mentioned.

Your letter of 7/19/05 specifically cites violations of G.L. C.93A, section 2 and section 3(9). We have made offers of settlement on several occasions to you in writing. We do not feel that Commerce Insurance Company has failed to effectuate a "prompt, fair and equitable settlement" as put forth in your latest letter. We have conducted a careful review of the medical records, medical bills and specials involved in this case and we disagree as to the value of the claim. We felt that your demands of \$195,000.00 and now of \$150,000.00 are not reasonable, and we have a valid disagreement over the overall value of this claim. As stated verbally, we have had this claim reviewed by staff at both Commerce Insurance Company and of Allstate Insurance Company. We feel that our evaluation and subsequent offers of settlement have been fair and made in good faith.

In addition, your letter of 7/19/05 informs us that your client's two children are now asserting loss of parental consortium claims. We do not have the information that would form the basis for your assertion that "each of these claims is worth \$10,000.00". If you have information that you would like to provide us for review regarding these alleged loss of consortium claims, we would be glad to review this information.

We again reiterate our combined offer with Allstate Insurance Company of \$36,400.00, (at 100%), and if there is additional information that you would like us to review, please forward this to my attention. We would like to resolve this claim with you, but unfortunately we are very far apart in our evaluation of this claim.

We request that if suit is filed as indicated, please forward a courtesy copy of the complaint.

We see no violations of M.G.L. Chapters 93A and 176D and section 2 and section 3(9). We hope this letter will clarify our position and answer any questions you may have regarding this matter. If you have any questions and would like to discuss this matter further, please contact me at extension 5537.

If you have any questions, please contact me at 1-800-221-1605, ext. 5537.

Sincerely,

THE COMMERCE INSURANCE COMPANY

Keryn McKeon Consultant

S 44 (Rev. 1990)Se 3:05-cv-30195-KPN C PANUIC 1991 € R SFIEL 199/01/2005 Page 15 of 16

The JS-44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. (SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON THE REVERSE OF THE FORM.)

I. (a) PLAINTIFFS TERIZA SHEHATOU P.P.A. TERIZA STERIZA SHEHATOU (b) County of Residence o (EXC	SHEHATOU AND S	ALLY LOUKA ondaga Cou	DEFENDANTS CHERYL L. SCHARDT, JAY A. HOPKINS, P. KEYBUR HOLLISTER, JOHN R. GOBEL, ALLSTATE INSURANCE COMPANY AND COMMERCE INSURANCE COMPANY County of Residence of First Listed (IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES ONLY) NOTE: IN LAND CONDEMNATION CASES, USE THE LOCATION OF THE LAND INVOLVED.					
Chris S. Do Donovan & C 1330 Mass M	O'Connor, LLP MoCA Way, Nort	h Adams, M	A 01247	Attorneys (If Kno	wn)			
II. BASIS OF JURISI	DICTION (Place an "X"	in One Box Only)			PRINCIPAL PARTII			
1 U.S. Government	3 Federal Question (U.S. Govern	ment Not a Party)	· ·	iversity Cases Only) PTI of This State		and One Box for Defendant) PTF DEF Principal Place 4 1 This State		
U.S. Government Defendant	4 Diversity (Indicate Citize in Item III)	zenship of Parties		of Another State X		d Principal 5 🗓 5 1 Another State		
				eign Country	19 E19 Poleigh Handh			
IV. NATURE OF SUI			FORE	PITTIDE/DENATITY	DANKBURTOV	OTHER STATISTIC		
CONTRACT 110 Insurance 120 Marine 130 Miller Act 140 Negotiable Instrument 150 Recovery of Overpayment & Enforcement of Judgment 151 Medicare Act 152 Recovery of Defaulted Student Loans (Excl. Veterans) 153 Recovery of Overpayment of Veteran's Benefits 160 Stockholders' Suits 190 Other Contract 195 Contract Product Liability REAL PROPERTY 210 Land Condemnation 220 Foreclosure 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment 240 Torts to Land 245 Tort Product Liability 290 All Other Real Property	TORTS PERSONAL INJURY 310 Airplane Product Liability 320 Assault, Libel & Slander 330 Federal Employers' Liability 340 Marine 345 Marine Product Liability 350 Motor Vehicle Product Liability 350 Motor Vehicle Product Liability 360 Other Personal Injury 380 Other Personal Property Damage Product Liability 385 Property Damage Product Liability 386 Property Damage Product Liability		General Gene	NS 0 Labor/Mgmt.Reporting & Disclosure Act 0 Railway Labor Act 0 Other Labor Litigation	□ 422 Appeal 28 USC 158 □ 423 Withdrawal	OTHER STATUTES 400 State Reapportionment 410 Antitrust 430 Banks and Banking 450 Commerce/ICC Rates/etc. 460 Deportation 470 Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations 810 Selective Service 850 Securities/Commodities/ Exchange 875 Customer Challenge 12 USC 3410 891 Agricultural Acts 892 Economic Stabilization Act 893 Environmental Matters 894 Energy Allocation Act 895 Freedom of Information Act 900 Appeal of Fee Determination Under Equal Access to Justice 950 Constitutionality of State Statutes 890 Other Stanutory Actions		
v. Original 2 Re	ite Court — /	Remanded from Appellate Court	4 Reopen	anothe sted or 5 (specified	Litigation	Juagment		
VI. CAUSE OF ACTI personal injuries, and unfair and de VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT: VIII. RELATED CAS IF ANY	including a torn rota ceptive trade practic CHECK IF TH UNDER F.R.C	ator cuff requiri es of insurance IS IS A CLASS ACT P. 23	ng surger defendar	ry arising out of nts. Additional	negligence of motor claims of loss of cons	sortium are asserted		
FOR OFFICE USE ONLY RECEIPT #	AMOUNT	CICNATURE OF A	TTORNEY OI	R RECORD NUDGE	MAG. JUD	GE		

306032

Case 3:05-cv-30195-KPN Document 1 Filed 09/01/2005 Page 16 of 16

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS

	TITLE O	F CASE (I	NAME OF F	FIRST PA	RTY ON E	EACH SIDE	ONLY)	TERIZA	A SHEHA	ATOU '	V. CH	ERYL	L. <u>s</u>	CHARD'	<u>r</u>
	CATEGO	ORY IN WI	IICH THE (CASE BE	LONGS B	SASED UP(ON THE	NUMBERE	D NATURE	OF SUIT	CODE	LISTED O	N THE	CIVIL CO	VED
	CATEGORY IN WHICH THE CASE BELONGS BASED UPON THE NUMBERED NATURE OF SUIT CODE LISTED ON THE CIVIL COVER SHEET. (SEE LOCAL RULE 40.1(A)(1)).														
		1.	160, 410), 470, R.2	23, REGA	RDLESS C	F NATU	RE OF SU	IT.						
		II.							720, 730, 7	40					
			790, 791	I, 820*, 8	30*, 840*	, 850, 890,	, 892-89	4, 895, 95(720, 730, 7).	* Al		plete AO			
	X	III.	315, 320	20, 130, 140, 151, 190, 210, 230, 240, 245, 290, 310, 20, 330, 340, 345, 350, 355, 360, 362, 365, 370, 371, 35, 450, 891.						for	patent,	trademar	k or co	pyright o	ases
		IV.	220, 422 690, 810	2, 423, 43), 861-86	0, 460, 5 5, 870, 87	10, 5 30, 6 [,] 71, 875, 90	10, 620, 10.	630, 640,	650, 660,						
		V.	150, 152	., 153.											
	TITLE AN		ER, IF ANY	, OF REL	ATED CA	SES. (SEE	ELOCAL	- RULE 40.	1(E))		·		_		
	HAS A PI	RIOR ACT	ION BETW	EEN THE	SAME P	ARTIES AN	ND BASE	D ON THE	SAME CL	AIM EVE		FILED IN	THIS C	OURT?	
	DOES TH	IE COMPL	AINT IN TH	IIS CASE	OUESTIC	ON THE CC	MCTITLE	YES	OF AN AC	NO	X				
			28 USC 2		4025110	M THE CO	MSIIIQ		T AN AC		NGRES:	S AFFECT	ring ti	HE PUBLI	3
					AGENT	OR EMPLO	OYEE OF	YES THE U.S.	_	NO	I X_I				
	IS THIS C	ASE REQ	UIRED TO	ВЕ НЕАГ	RD AND D	ETERMINE	ED BY A	YES DISTRICT	COURT OF	NO THREE	JUDGES	PURSU/	ANT TO	TITLE 28	usc
	2284?							YES		NO	\mathbf{x}				
	DO ALL F	PARTIES I	N THIS AC	TION RES	SIDE IN TI	HE CENTR	AL DIVIS	SION OF TH	IE DISTRIC	T OF MA	SSACH	USETTS (WORC	ESTER	
			CAL RULI RN DIVISIO			RANKLIN.	HAMPD	YES	MPSHIRE (NO COLINTIE	.e/3/6E	ELOCAL	חוור	40.445\)	
								YES		NO	X				
						E PLAINTI		YES	ENTRAL AI	ND/OR W	ESTERI	N DIVISIO	NS OF	THE DIST	RICT
	IN WHICH	DIVISION	DO THE (ONLY PA	RTIES RE	SIDING IN	MASSA	CHUSETTS	RESIDE?	We	ster	<u>n</u>		_	_
	IF ANY OF THE U.S.A	THE PAR A. OR THE	RTIES ARE COMMON	THE UNI	TED STA , DO ALL	TES, COMI	MONWE	ALTH OF N	IASSACHU THE	SETTS,	OR ANY	GOVERN	MENT	AL AGENO) Y
	CENTRAL	. DIVISION	; YES	□ NO			OR W	ESTERN D	IVISION;	YES	X	NC	, [
	ALTERNA	TIVE DISP	UTE RESC	DLUTION	- IS THIS	CASE SUI	TABLE F	OR ADR?	IF SO, BY	WHICH A	ADR?				
ļ	EARLY NE	EUTRAL E	VALUATIO	N 🗵		MEDIAT	ION -	図	SUMMA	RY JUR	Y/BENC	H TRIAL			
	MINI-TRIAI YPE OR PI					OTHER									
RNEY	"S NAME_	Chri	s S. I	Oodig.	_Esq.	. Dono	van /	\$_0!co	nor, I	TD					
ESS_		1330	Mass	MoCA	Way,	North	Adams	s, MA	01247	- 1., E	_				
DUON	E NO.) 663-								-			·	

(Category Form.wpd - 3/28/2000)